



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,550	12/26/2001	Katsuhiko Suzuki	H07-138280M/NHK	8312
21254	7590	06/16/2005	EXAMINER	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			DOTE, JANIS L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1756	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,550

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

Janis L. Dote

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 8, 27 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 8, 27 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1756

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on Apr. 27, 2005, has been entered.

2. The examiner acknowledges the cancellation of claims 5, 6, 9, 10, 21-26, and 28-33, and the amendments to claims 1 and 2, set forth in the amendment filed on Mar. 14, 2005, which was entered upon the filing of the RCE on Apr. 27, 2005. The examiner also acknowledges the amendments to claims 1 and 2 and the addition of claim 34 set forth in the amendment filed on Apr. 27, 2005. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 27, and 34 are pending.

3. The rejections of claims 21-23 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the office action mailed on Dec. 29, 2004, paragraphs 4 and 5, have been mooted by the cancellation of claims 21-23 and 28-33.

The rejections of claims 1-10 and 21-33 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, set forth in the office action

Art Unit: 1756

mailed on Dec. 29, 2004, paragraphs 7 and 8, have been withdrawn in response to the amendments to claims 1 and 2, and the cancellation of claims 28-33 set forth in the amendment filed on Mar. 14, 2005, that was entered on Apr. 27, 2005.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 34 recites that the peripheral speed (V_p) of the image carrier is "at least 1800 mm/sec."

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the image carrier peripheral speed. The originally filed specification at page 16, line 5,

Art Unit: 1756

discloses that the results shown in Figs. 5 and 6 were obtained with a photosensitive body, i.e., image carrier, peripheral speed of 1800 mm/sec. The originally filed specification does not disclose that the photosensitive body is rotated at a peripheral speed of "at least 1800 mm/sec." The claim language "at least 1800 mm/sec" is broader than the disclosed single peripheral speed of 1800 mm/sec because it includes peripheral speeds greater than 1800 mm/sec.

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,923,933 (Anzai) combined with Japanese Patent 2000-267338 (JP'338). See the DERWENT English-language translation of JP'338 for cites.

Anzai discloses an image forming method comprising the steps of: (1) developing an electrostatic latent image formed on an image carrier 1 with a two-component developer comprising a toner and magnetic carrier; (2) transferring the toner image onto a recording medium; and (3) fixing the transferred toner image to the recording medium using the fixing device 25. See Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 27-34, and col. 4, line 56, to col. 5,

Art Unit: 1756

line 5. Anzai at col. 8, lines 4-10, discloses that the fixing device 25 is composed of a heated roller 27 and a back-up pressing roller 26 to fix the toner image transferred to a paper sheet. In other words, Anzai's fixing device 25 uses heat and pressure to fix a toner image on a recording material, such as paper.

In the Anzai method, the electrostatic latent image is developed by a developing device that comprises a first developing roller 61 and a counter-rotating second developing roller 62, and a regulating member 8 between the first and second developing rollers. The regulating member 8 distributes the developing agent to the first and second developing rollers. Col. 5, lines 39-67. The regulating member 8 is within the developing agent distributing member structural limitation recited in instant claims 1 and 2.

The first developing roller 61 moves in a direction opposite to the image carrier 1, and the second roller 62 moves in the same direction as the image carrier 1. Anzai discloses that when the ratio of circumferential (or peripheral) speed S_1 of the first developing roller 61 to the circumferential speed of the image carrier 1 is set to 1.5, the ratio of the circumferential speed of the second roller to the image carrier S_2 is in the range of 1.5 to 3.5, preferably of 2 to 3, to

Art Unit: 1756

obtain an "allowable image." Col. 12, lines 23-27. Anzai exemplifies S2 ratios of 1.5 and 2.0. See Fig. 2. The S1 ratio of 1.5 is within the S1 ratio ranges recited in instant claims 1, 2, 3, and 7. The exemplified Anzai S2 ratios, i.e., 1.5 or 2, are within the ranges of 1.05 to 2.0 recited in instant claims 1 and 2. The exemplified Anzai S2 ratio of 1.5 is also within the range of 1.1 to 1.9 recited in instant claims 4 and 8. The Anzai ratio S2 ranges also overlap the range of 1.05 to 2.0 and 1.1 to 1.9 recited in instant claims 1 and 2 and claims 4 and 8, respectively.

Anzai does not disclose the use of a toner having the shape coefficients SF1 and SF2 as recited in instant claims 1 and 2. Anzai discloses that "the toner used is a toner containing a resin, a coloring material, a charging control material and so on and having a volume average particle size of 5 to 12 μm ." Anzai discloses that the resin can be copolymer of styrene and acrylic acid or a polyester resin. Anzai teaches that toners having said particles are capable of providing a "high resolution print above 16 lines per mm." Col. 9, lines 52-60.

JP'338 discloses a toner having shape coefficients SF1 and SF2 of 148 and 123, respectively, which are within the ranges of 120 to 170 and 110 to 130, respectively, recited in instant claims 1 and 2, and within the ranges of 130 to 160 and 115

Art Unit: 1756

to 130, respectively, recited in instant claim 27. See toner 1 at paragraphs 0058-0060, and Table 1 at paragraph 0075. The toner has a volume average particle size of 8.0 μm . See paragraph 0059. The volume average particle size of 8.0 μm is within the range of 5 to 12 μm taught by Anzai. JP'338's toner comprises a polyester binder resin, a wax, and colorant. JP'338 teaches that the toner may further comprise a charge control agent to adjust the electrification of the toner.

Paragraph 0048. JP'338 discloses that its toner can be used in a two-component developer comprising a magnetic carrier.

Paragraphs 0052-0053.

According to JP'338, its toner has superior powder characteristics, such as storage stability, and good offset resistance. Paragraphs 0007 and 0076. JP'338 further discloses that its toner can be fixed without the use of a releasing oil. Paragraph 0054. JP'338 discloses that when the releasing oil evaporates, an unpleasant smell may be given off or it may contaminate the inside of the imaging apparatus.

Paragraph 0004, lines 29-32. Furthermore, JP'338 teaches that "according to the electrophotographic toner of this invention, when treated in a copying machine as a powder, there is no problem in the fluidity [of the toner]." Paragraph 0012, lines 1-4. In other words, JP'338 teaches that its toner does

Art Unit: 1756

not aggregate or stick to itself or to the components of the apparatus.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to select the JP'338 toner 1 having shape coefficients SF1 and SF2 of 148 and 123, respectively, as the toner in the image forming method disclosed by Anzai, and to use a fixing device without using a release oil in the fixing step in said method, because that person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an image forming method that provides fixed toned images on recording media without offset and without unpleasant odors as taught by JP'338.

The recitation "said developing . . . comprises selecting said toners having said shape coefficients . . . such that an excessive stress is prevented from being applied to said developing agent between said first and second developing rollers and a developing agent distributing member formed between said first and second developing rollers to restrict an occurrence of photographic fog" in the instant claims 1 and 2 is a statement of intended use, which do not distinguish the method rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Anzai and JP'338. The instant specification at page 19, line 21, to page 21, line 10, discloses that the prevention of stress being applied to the developing agent as the toner passes through the

Art Unit: 1756

developing agent distributing member and through between the two developing rollers is accomplished when the first and second developing rollers rotate at the peripheral speed ratios S1 and S2 in the range of 0.8 to 2.0 and of 1.05 to 2.0, respectively, and the developing step uses a developing agent consisting mainly of magnetic carriers and toners, where the toners have a shape coefficient SF2 in the range of 110 to 130. The specification at page 21, lines 2-9, further discloses that the toner spent (the adherence and fusion of toner to the surface of the carrier,) gives raise to the occurrence of fog. The recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art or in a process, a manipulative difference, in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). As discussed above, Anzai teaches a method that meets the steps recited in the instant claims but for the use of the particular toner recited in the instant claims. The JP'338 toner has an SF1 and an SF2 that meet the SF1 and SF2 limitations recited in the instant claims; and JP'338 provides reason, suggestion, and motivation to use the JP'338 toner in the method disclosed by Anzai. Thus, the intended use recited in the instant claims does not result in a

Art Unit: 1756

difference between the method recited in the instant claims and the method rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Anzai and JP' 338.

Applicant's arguments filed on Mar. 14, 2005, and on Apr. 27, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the response filed on Mar. 14, 2005, applicants assert that the references are "completely unrelated" and that "no person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered combining these disparate references." Applicants assert that the "Examiner can point to no motivation and suggestion in the references to urge the combination as alleged by the Examiner."

However, as discussed in the rejection above, the Anzai method comprises the steps recited in the instant claims but for the use of the particular toner. Anzai also discloses a fixing step which utilizes a fixing device 25 that is composed of a heated roller 27 and a back-up pressing roller 26 to fix the toner image transferred to a paper sheet. In other words, the Anzai fixing device 25 uses heat and pressure to fix a toner image on a recording material, such as paper. As noted by applicants, JP' 338 also "uses heat and pressure to fix an image [toner] to recording media, such as paper." See applicants' response filed on Jun. 6, 2003, page 12, lines 14-19. Thus,

Art Unit: 1756

both Anzai and JP'338 teach heat-fixing a toner image on a recording medium, such as paper, with a heat-fixing device by the use of pressure and heat. Accordingly, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the Anzai imaging method comprises a heat-fixing step, and that the use of a heat-fixing device without using a release oil, as taught by JP'338, can readily be used in Anzai's heat-fixing step.

In the responses filed on Mar. 14, 2005, and Apr. 27, 2005, applicants also assert that neither reference teaches or suggests that the developing step "comprises selecting said toners having said shape coefficients . . . such that an excessive stress is prevented from being applied to said developing agent between said first and second developing rollers and a developing agent distributing member formed between said first and second developing rollers to restrict an occurrence of photographic fog" in the instant claims 1 and 2.

However, for the reasons discussed in the rejection above, that recitation is a statement of intended use that does not distinguish the method recited in the instant claims from the method rendered obvious over the prior art. Moreover, there is no disclosure in Anzai that explicitly excludes of use of toners having the shape factors SF1 and SF2 as recited in the instant

Art Unit: 1756

claims. Nor does Anzai disclose that the use of such toners are detrimental to its invention.

In the response filed on Mar. 14, 2005, applicants assert that JP'338 exemplifies a low speed printing method, while the image forming method recited in the instant claims can utilize "an ultra-high speed class printer." Applicants assert that JP'338 does not teach or suggest a center feed developing system. In the responses filed on Mar. 14, 2005, and Apr. 27, 2005, applicants assert that JP'338 does not teach or suggest selecting the shape coefficients to adjust the toner fluidity to overcome the problems of high-speed printing with a center feed developing system.

Applicants' assertions are not persuasive. The instant claims do not require the use of an ultra-high speed class printer. Applicants cannot argue patentability based on limitations that are not present in the claims. Furthermore, the reasons to combine the references do not have to be those of applicants. As discussed in the rejection, JP'338 teaches a toner that not only meets the toner shape coefficients SF1 and SF2 limitations recited in instant claim 1 and 2 but also has the properties that Anzai teaches are desirable for use in Anzai's imaging method. JP'338 discloses the advantages of using its toner in electrophotographic imaging processes. Thus,

a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found reason, suggestion, and motivation in the teachings of JP'338 and Anzai to use the JP'338 toner and a fixing device without using a release oil in the image forming method taught by Anzai.

In the response filed on Mar. 14, 2005, applicants further state that the Anzai S2 ratio range is 1.5 to 2.5, preferably of 2 to 3; and where in Fig. 2 of Anzai, the range of 2 to 2.5 is more preferred. Applicants assert that, as described in the instant specification discloses, that when the S2 ratio is set equal to or more than 2, damage to toners and developing agent is increased.

However, as noted in the rejection above, Anzai teaches that when the S1 ratio is 1.5, the S2 ratio capable of obtaining an allowable image can be 1.5 to 3.5. Anzai exemplifies S2 ratios of 1.5 and 2.0 that meet the S2 range recited in the instant claims. Instant claims 1 and 2 recite that the S2 ratio is in the range of 1.05 to 2.0; they do not exclude the S2 ratio from being 2.0.

In the response filed on Apr. 27, 2005, applicants assert that Anzai does not disclose that "the toner described in Anzai solves the [applicants'] problems." Applicants conclude that it is not obvious to combine Anzai with JP'338 which describes a shape coefficient SF of toner.

Art Unit: 1756

However, as discussed supra, the reasons to combine the references do not have to be those of applicants. JP'338 teaches a toner that meets the toner shape coefficients SF1 and SF2 limitations recited in instant claim 1 and 2. Thus, for the reasons discussed in the rejection, the combined teachings of Anzai and JP'338 render the instantly claimed image forming method obvious.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above and in the rejection, the rejection stands.

8. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 27, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,630,201 (Suzuki) combined with Diamond, Handbook of Imaging materials, pp. 160-161, and Fig. 4.1 (Diamond), and US 6,096,468 (Ohno).

Suzuki discloses an image forming method comprising the steps of: (1) developing an image (i.e., an electrostatic latent image) formed on a photosensitive drum 1 with certain photoconductivity (i.e., image carrier) with a two-component developer comprising a toner and magnetic carrier. See Fig. 1, col. 2, line 54, to col. 3, line 49.

In the Suzuki method, the electrostatic latent image is developed by a developing device that comprises a first developing roller 5 and a counter-rotating second developing

Art Unit: 1756

roller 8, and a developer control member 16 between the first and second developing rollers. The developer control member 16 distributes the developing agent to the first and second developing rollers. See Fig. 1, col. 2, line 67, to col. 3, line 1; col. 3, lines 5-6; and col. 3, lines 27-49. The developer control member 8 is within the developing agent distributing member structural limitation recited in instant claims 1 and 2.

The first developing roller 5 moves in a direction opposite to the photosensitive drum 1, and the second roller 8 moves in the same direction as the photosensitive drum 1. Col. 2, line 67, to col. 3, line 1; and col. 3, line 5-6. Suzuki discloses that peripheral speed of the photosensitive drum may range from 1000 to 1800 mm/s. Col. 6, lines 34-35. The peripheral speed of 1800 mm/s is within the range "at least 1800 mm/s" recited in instant claim 34. Suzuki further teaches that uniform high-density images could be obtained when the rotation speed of the second developer roller 8 is 0.6 to 1.5 times the speed of the photosensitive drum 1; and that excellent results could be demonstrated when the ratio of rotation (the peripheral velocity ratio) ranges from 1.05 to 1.5. Col. 6, lines 36-42. Suzuki teaches that "stable cleaning effect and the development effect of high quality" could be obtained when

Art Unit: 1756

the rotation speed of the first development roller 5 is 0.5 to 1.5 times the rotation speed of the photosensitive drum 1.

Col. 6, lines 45-48. The rotation speed ratio of the second developer roller 8 to the photosensitive drum 1 of 1.05 to 1.5 is within the S2 ranges recited in instant claims 1, 2, 4, and 8. The upper limit of the rotation speed ratio of the first developer roller 5 to the photosensitive drum 1, i.e., 1.5, is within the S1 ranges recited in instant claims 1, 2, 3, and 7. The rotation speed ratio range of the first developer roller 5 to the photosensitive drum 1, i.e., 0.5 to 1.5, overlaps the S1 ranges recited in instant claims 1, 2, 3, and 7.

According to Suzuki, the developing method reduces the load to the photosensitive body and the developer, and provides high quality images at higher reliability even when the printing is at high speed. Col. 9, lines 8-13.

Suzuki does not disclose that its image forming method further comprises the steps of transferring the toner image from the photosensitive drum 1 to a recording medium and fixing the transferred image to the recording medium as recited in instant claims 1 and 2.

However it is well known in the electrophotographic arts to transfer the toner image formed on a photosensitive member, i.e., photoconductor, to a recording medium such as paper, and

Art Unit: 1756

to fuse, i.e., fix, the transferred toner image to the recording medium to form a permanent image. See Diamond, Handbook of Imaging materials, page 160, lines 30-32, page 161, second and third full paragraphs, and Fig. 4.1.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Diamond, to incorporate the steps of transferring the developed toner image on the photosensitive drum 1 to a recording medium, such as paper, and fixing the transferred toner image to the recording medium in the method disclosed by Suzuki, because that person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an image forming method that provides permanently fixed high quality images.

Suzuki does not disclose the use of a toner having the shape coefficients SF1 and SF2 as recited in instant claims 1 and 2. However, Suzuki discloses that the toner may have an average grain diameter of 6 to 12 μm . Suzuki teaches that toners having said diameter can "contribute to the achievement of enhanced quality and higher definition for image developed." Col. 4, lines 40-45.

Ohno teaches a toner having shape coefficients SF1 and SF2 of 150 and 130, respectively, which are within the ranges of 120 to 170 and 110 to 130, respectively, recited in instant claims 1

Art Unit: 1756

and 2, and within the ranges of 130 to 160 and 115 to 130, respectively, recited in instant claim 27. See toner G at col. 41, lines 10-56; col. 43, lines 19-22; and Table 3A at col. 59. The toner has a weight average particle size of 6.9 μm . See Table 3B, toner production example 7. The weight average particle size of 6.9 μm is within the range of 6 to 12 μm taught by Suzuki. Ohno discloses that the toner can be used in a two-component developer comprising a magnetic carrier. Col. 42, lines 42-46.

Accordingly to Ohno, the toner does not "adversely affect the photosensitive member . . . [and] may less cause image deterioration such as fog and . . . [is] highly applicable to electrophotographic process. Col. 2, lines 59-63; and Table 4, toner G. In other words, the toner does not damage the photosensitive member to cause faulty images.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Ohno, to select the Ohno toner G having shape coefficients SF1 and SF2 of 150 and 130, respectively, as the toner in the image forming method rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Suzuki and Diamond, because that person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an image forming method that provides permanently fixed toned images with less fog on

Art Unit: 1756

recording media that does not adversely affect the photosensitive member.

The recitation "said developing . . . comprises selecting said toners having said shape coefficients . . . such that an excessive stress is prevented from being applied to said developing agent between said first and second developing rollers and a developing agent distributing member formed between said first and second developing rollers to restrict an occurrence of photographic fog" in the instant claims 1 and 2 is a statement of intended use for the reasons discussed in paragraph 7 above. The recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art or in a process, a manipulative difference, in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As discussed in the rejection above, the combined teachings of Suzuki and Diamond render obvious an image forming method that meets the steps recited in the instant claims but for the use of the particular toner recited in the instant claims. The Ohno toner has an SF1 and an SF2 that meet the SF1 and SF2 limitations recited in the instant claims; and Ohno provides reason, suggestion, and motivation to use the toner in the method rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Suzuki and Diamond. Thus, the

Art Unit: 1756

intended use recited in the instant claims does not result in a difference between the method recited in the instant claims and the method rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Suzuki, Diamond, and Ohno.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janis L. Dote whose telephone number is (571) 272-1382. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Mark Huff, can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The central fax phone number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry regarding papers not received regarding this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Supervisory Application Examiner Ms. Claudia Sullivan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1052.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JLD

Jun. 9, 2005

Janis L. Dote
JANIS L. DOTE
EXAMINER
670-1700
1700